Mobile Cloud Business Process Management System for the Internet of Things: Review, Challenges and Blueprint

Chii Chang, Satish Narayana Srirama
Mobile and Cloud Computing Laboratory
Institute of Computer Science
University of Tartu, Estonia
{chang; srirama}@ut.ee

Rajkumar Buyya
Cloud Computing and Distributed Systems (CLOUDS) Laboratory
Department of Computing and Information Systems
University of Melbourne, Australia
rbuyya@unimelb.edu.au

arXiv:1512.07199v1 [cs.CY] 21 Dec 2015

***Abstract*—The Internet of Things (IoT) represents a comprehensive environment that consists of large number of sensors and mediators interconnecting heterogeneous physical objects to the Internet. IoT applications can be found in many areas such as smart city, smart workplace, smart plants, smart agriculture and various ubiquitous computing areas. Meanwhile, Business Process Management Systems (BPMS) has become a successful and efficient solution for coordinated management and optimised utilisation of resources/entities. However, managing large scale connected heterogeneous IoT entities in BPMS is facing many issues that were not considered in the past BPMS. Without fully understanding the behaviour, capability and state of the *thing*, the BPMS can fail to manage the IoT integrated information systems. In this paper, we analyse existing BPMS for IoT and identify the limitations and their drawbacks. Then, we try to improve the existing works with the elastic mobile cloud resources. The aim of this paper is to provide a guidance to Mobile Cloud Computing (MCC) disciplines what are the issues in BPMS for IoT and how MCC can be the promising solution to address issues and overcome the challenges.**

***Index Terms*—Internet of Things, Mobile Cloud Computing, Business Process Management System, Service-Oriented, review, state of the art, challenge.**

I. Introduction

Emerging mature mobile and ubiquitous computing technology is hastening the realisation of smart environments, in which the physical objects involved in our everyday life (food, parcels, appliances, vehicles, buildings etc.) are connected. Many of the electronic devices are now granted with a certain intelligence to work together for us and enhance our life. The core enabler is the Internet Protocol (IP) that is capable of providing the addressing mechanism for physical objects towards interconnecting everything with the Internet, which is known as the Internet of Things (IoT) [1]. The goal of IoT is to enhance the broad range of people's lives including but not limited to agriculture, transportation, logistic, education, healthcare and more [2]. Industry predicts in year 2020, around 50 billion physical things will be connected with the Internet [3], and the economy revenue value will raise up to $1.9 to $7.1 trillion [4]–[6].

Today, IoT has become one of the most popular topics for both industry and academia. The notion of connecting large scale physical things with the Internet leads the IoT research tread to process management [7]. Prior to the vision of IoT has arisen, the Cyber-Physical Systems (CPS), which interconnected the physical entities with software systems, are usually isolated. Each sub-system has its own topology and communication protocols. In order to integrate the isolated CPS into the IoT vision, one promising approach is to apply Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA)-based middleware solution [8]. Fundamentally, SOA introduces the interoperability to heterogeneous isolated systems. By Applying SOA, CPS can manage individual objects as atomic services or they can configure a group of objects to provide composite services. For example, a mobile Internet connected device can embed a Web service to provide the atomic sensory information service to remote Web service clients [9]. Further, a composite service can exploit the data derived from multiple devices in a specific location to compute and generate the meaningful information to specific users.

In the last decade, Workflow Management Systems (WfMS) have become one of the major components of service composition. Among the different WfMS, Business Process Management Systems (BPMS) have been broadly accepted the de facto approaches in WfMS [10], mainly because of the availability of tools and international standards such as Business Process Execution Language (BPEL) [11] and Business Process Model and Notation (BPMN) [12]. BPMS are *"generic software system(s) that is driven by explicit process designs to enact and manage operational business processes. The system should be process-aware and generic in the sense that it is possible to modify the processes it supports. The process designs are often graphical and the focus is on structured processes that need to handle many cases"* [13]. BPMS can provide the highly integrated platforms to manage comprehensive entities and activities involved in IoT systems. BPMS also provide self-managed behaviour in various IoT applications such as smart home system [8], [14], crowd computing [15], Wireless Sensor Network [16], heating, ventilating and air conditioning

(HVAC) system [17], mobile healthcare [18] and so on. BPMS let users (e.g. system administrators, domain scientists, regular end users) to easily manage the overall IoT system without getting involved in the low-level complex programming languages. Hence, they can focus on modelling the behaviour and business processes of the things. Furthermore, with the optimised process model, the IoT system can provide self-adaptation in which it can autonomously react to or prevent the events based on runtime context information [19].

Although BPMS have been used in IoT environments, many challenges have not yet been broadly covered. BPMS involve model *design*, *implementation*, *deployment* and *management & optimisation* phases. Each phase involves different requirements and challenges. In this paper, we provide a comprehensive review on state-of-the-art of BPMS for IoT. We identify the open challenges and propose a system design that addresses the requirements by using Mobile Cloud Computing (MCC) technology.

MCC represents the integration of mobile computing and cloud computing in which it addresses the elastic cloud resource provisioning and the optimised interaction between cloud services and mobile network nodes. Disciplines in MCC addressed many studies in mobile connectivity, mobility, discovery, resource-awareness, decentralised service interaction and how the system efficiently integrates the mobile entities as process participants with cloud services. In past several years, numerous MCC-related WfMS have been proposed including the mobile device-hosted WfMS engines [20]–[23], WfMS for enabling mobile ad hoc cloud computing [24], WfMS for IoT that are exploiting both mobile and utility cloud resources [25]–[27] and so on. MCC has shown the promising solution for efficient integration of information systems with resource constrained wireless Internet connected entities for distributed process management. Hence, in this paper, we intend to address the issues of BPMS for IoT by applying MCC concepts.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: Section II describes the research questions in BPMS for IoT. Section III provides the state-of-the-art literature survey in BPMS for IoT based on the phases of BPMS and section IV compares the existing frameworks. In section V we identify the open challenges and issues that have not yet been fully addressed in existing works. In section VI we propose our framework design to enable adaptive Mobile Cloud BPMS for IoT. The paper is concluded in Section VII together with discussion of our study.

II. Research Questions

Although BPMS have been applied in many IoT application domains and have shown the promising solutions, many of them have not considered the challenges that the BPMS will face in near future IoT environments. We summarise the challenges below:

Process Distribution in Heterogeneous Environments
Classic BPMS were designed mainly for common enterprise IT entities such as HTTP-based Web services (either SOAP or REST) that have been highly supported by commercial BPM engines. They did not consider about the heterogeneous IoT entities as a part of BP model [28].



Figure 1: Common SOA-based BPMS for IoT.

Figure 1 illustrates a common SOA-based BPMS architecture that involves IoT entities and the middleware-based information system. As the Figure shows, the BPMS have no direct interaction with the edge network (i.e. front-end wireless Internet connected nodes such as mobile phones, wireless sensors, data collectors etc.). The design that hides the detail topology and communication at the edge network may cause the process designer unable to properly define the behaviours and processes of the things in terms of adding participants, modifying or customising the processes, react or prevent failures and so on. Further, recent IoT management systems often involve edge nodes as a part of the BPMS in the scenarios such as as logistic [29], crowdsourcing processes [30], HVAC system [17], healthcare services [18], Ambient Assisted Living [31], real-time sensing [27] where mobile and wireless network objects are involved.

Comprehensive Adaptation
Adaptive BPMS are capable of performing autonomous actions to react to different events. Adaptation involves self-optimising, self-healing, and self-adapting [32], where self-optimising denotes the system is capable of selecting component services according to the Quality of Service (QoS) criteria; self-healing denotes the system is capable of detecting and reacting to violations; self-adapting means the system should be able to adjust and to perform runtime changes of its component services with minimal or none human intervention. Current adaptation algorithms are designed specifically for certain use cases only. They lack the comprehensive solution for generic adaptive system [33]. However, as the vision [33] indicates, in the future IoT environments, devices will cooperate automatically for certain tasks. Enabling self-adaptive BPMS will further involve autonomous device-to-device collaboration in the opportunistic manner, which involves the real time service discovery and the on-demand service composition mechanisms.

Complexity
IoT systems involve a large number of resource constrained devices such as sensors and actuators with limited computing capabilities and often powered using batteries. Most of existing Web service-oriented BPMS designed for CPS are complex and may not be suitable for integrating IT system with services

provided by the resource constrained IoT devices. SOA-based IT systems often use interface and middleware technologies to leverage different entities. However, due to the lack of standardisation in process modelling and execution levels, systems were usually resulting in a complex and inflexible design. For example, based on the architecture described in Figure 1, if two devices, which are connected with different backend servers but located at physical proximity, intend to interact with each other, the communication needs to pass through multiple layers, in which the direct interaction does not exist and it also affects the overall performance.

III. Integrating IoT with BPMS

BPMS for IoT involves four phases in life cycle (see Figure 2). *Design* phase involves how to model the connected things, their related elements and how their behaviour in the business process. The *Implementation* phase involves how the process model be implemented as executable methods for information systems. The *Deployment* phase involves how the executable methods to be deployed to the corresponding workflow engines. The *Management & Optimisation* phase corresponds to how the BPMS autonomously manages the system and how it continuously improves and optimises the process. If the processes need to be improved, the system needs to be re-designed and continue with the cycle. The following subsections provide a state-of-the-art review and analysis on each phase of the life cycle.



Figure 2: BPMS for IoT life cycle.

A. Design Phase

The *design* phase of BPMS for IoT involves: (1) *Architecture*: the system is based on centralised orchestration or decentralised choreography or a hybrid system that inherits the features from both; (2) *Modelling*: the process model will use only existing methods (e.g. notations of standard BPMN) to design the IoT entities and their activities or will it introduce new elements for best describing the model? further, what entities need to be considered? IoT devices may not be interacted by simple request/response services like regular SOAP-based Web services. They may involve different types of communications that have never been considered in classic BPMS; (3) *Transparency*: the process modelling should provide a comprehensive view of the overall execution environment.

Below, we discuss the subjects that are involved in the *design* phase.

Orchestration v.s. Choreography

BPMS can be broadly classified to two types: orchestration and choreography. Orchestration is mainly based on centralised architecture in which the entire process model is managed by a single management system. On the other hand, choreography represents a system that involves a certain stage that the process models (or the potions of the process model) will be entirely handled by a number of external information systems. While orchestration has been widely applied in IoT-related BPMS, recent works have emphasised the importance of choreography in IoT. For example, [7], [31] considered that the centralised orchestration is insufficient to agilely react to events occurring at the edge networks. Especially in an inter-organisational network or in the mobile IoT scenarios that involve numerous mobile Internet connected participants. In such scenarios, applying choreography-based architecture to enable a certain degree of business process distribution will be needed, in which the edge nodes or mobile nodes will need the process execution engine and self-manageable abilities. Distributing process execution at edge nodes can further enhance the flexibility, agility and adaptability of the BPMS for IoT [17], [18], [31].

Existing v.s. Extension

Introducing the IoT in BPMS is not a straightforward task. Things can be heterogeneous in terms of communication protocols, network topologies (e.g. connectivity), specifications (e.g. computational power and battery life). In general, there are two approaches to model the entities of IoT:

Expressing things as services. Modelling the things as URI-based services can simplify the management systems and also be fully compatible with existing tool such as BPMN. In this approach, the things are expressed as regular network services that can be interacted via the request-response model. The network services embedded in the things can be standard SOAP services [18] that can be realised either by using the XML-based W3C—SOAP, OASIS—Devices Profile for Web Services (DPWS) or it can be realised by REST-based services [31]. Generally, in this approach, it is assumed that the thing can be connected directly based on the Web service communication. However, in real world systems, most IoT devices do not work as regular Web service entities. Therefore, many researches are focusing on defining new elements in BPMS for IoT.

Defining new IoT elements. In general, BPMS such as Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems often assumed that the system will provide automation to all the involved devices, and all the devices will have capability to be directly invoked by the systems. However, in IoT systems, such assumption, in many cases, is not applicable [28]. IoT entities that have different capabilities may connect with the management system differently. Beside the regular direct IP network connected devices, in many scenarios, the things are connected via multiple network layers or routings. For example, an actuator device may connect with a sink service or a gateway service provided by different devices in order

to be accessed by the management system in the cloud. In such a case, accessing the actuator involves the process of the gateway service provider. Another example is when the BPMS involves continuous tasks such as sensor data steaming and eventing, exiting standard-based BPM modelling tools cannot explicitly define the process [34]. In such cases, the BPMS need a more proper way to let designers to model the process accordingly in order to fully manage and optimise the systems. A common approach is to introduce specific IoT elements in BPM to differentiate them from the traditional BPM elements such as service tasks in BPMN.

Next, we discuss how existing works are introducing IoT elements in BPMS.

Modelling Things and Elements

Table I summarises what are the IoT elements that have been modelled in the existing works.

As the table shows, sensor is the most common element that has been introduced in the existing literature. Followed by the actuator and the specific data object. The definition of the specific data object is differentiated based on the application domain. We summarise each element below.

Table I: IoT elements addressed in the literatures

Projects	Actuator	Sensor	Reader	Collector	Event Streaming	Intermediary Operation	Specific Data Object
makeSense [30]		X					
BPMN4WSN [16]	X	X				X	
SPUs [34]					X		X
Meyer et al. [28]	X	X					
uBPMN [35]		X	X	X			X

Actuator. Commonly, actuator is a controller device that can perform a certain command to physical entities. For example, an IoT system can remotely switch on or off a light via an interconnected light switch actuator. Although some works such as [28] simply introduce a specific notation to represent the actuator task, considering that the behaviour of actuator is almost the same as a regular URI-based service, the process of an actuator can be modelled as a participant in BPM (or a pool in BPMN). For example, in [16], actuators are modelled as pools with parallel processes in BPMN.

Sensor. It is the most common element considered in BPMS for IoT. Sensor devices are mainly used to acquire specific data such as brightness, temperature, an entity's movement, moving direction and so on. Existing works model sensors differently. Authors in [28] recommended that modelling the physical entities (sensors and actuators) as the sub-class of participants of BPM (i.e. pool in BPMN) is the best approach to meet all the requirements of integrating the physical entities of IoT with BPM. A similar model can also be found in [16]. On the other hand, authors in [35] introduced Sensor Task that represents the data acquisition activities performed by the physical sensor devices. In their case, they did not specify the physical entities in the process model. Instead, the sensor activities are modelled as the sub-class of the regular Task class in BPMN, and is of the same level as Service Task. A similar approach has been used in the Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning (HVAC)-based management system [17].

Reader and Collector. They are defined in [35] as the sub-classes of Task element in BPM. A Reader Task represent an activity that involves retrieving data from Bar code, RFID, Biometrics objects etc. From RESTful service perspective, a Reader Task is similar to a service that provides only GET request/response. A Collector Task is a task that involves collecting data from other objects aside from Sensor Task and Reader Task. Based on the design in [35], a Collector Task is accompanied with database or Data Object related activities. In a real-time mobile sensing scenario [27], in which the smart phone is used as a mediator to collect data from surrounding sensor devices for identifying the environmental events. In such a scenario, the smart phone's activity can be considered as a Collector Task.

Event Streaming. It is a less studied but an important mechanism that will be highly applied in future IoT scenarios. Considering that existing BPMS have supported single events but lack of feasible integration across the process modelling, the process execution and the IT infrastructure layer, authors in [34] introduced specific element—Stream Process Unit (SPU) in BPM to integrate the continuous event streaming processes. The primary differences between the SPU task and the existing BPMN elements such as Service Task, Loop or parallel operation are: (1) SPU is based on advertisement/subscription of event streaming process that is operated in isolation from the main process workflow; (2) SPU performs the process continuously to fulfil a single process, which is different to the Loop that is repeating certain processes.

Intermediary Operation. It represents a process that is required to perform advanced activities based on the sensory information. Most of existing works [28], [31], [35] consider the sensor activities as the processes to collect the raw context data. Author in [16] further considers that the raw context data may need to be processed (e.g. interpreted to a meaningful information for the user) before it is sent to the requester. Such a requirement is less considered in the other works because it is commonly expected that the raw context data will be processed based on the need of the requester. For customisation reason, requesters may have their own algorithm to process the data. However, in the future inter-organisational IoT environment, the data collector may also be interesting in providing additional context interpreting service to their data consumers.

Specific Data Object. Data Object in classic BPM represents a data or a file that is transmitted from one activity to another. Commonly, it is a one time transmission. In uBPMN [35], the authors introduced *Smart Object* element, which is the sub-class of *data object* in BPMN. The *Smart Object* element,

which consists of the type attribute to describe the source of the data, represents the data collected by Sensor Task or Reader Task. In SPUs [34], [36], authors introduced *Event Stream* data object. Different to the classic data object in BPMN that represents one single flow of data transmission, the *Event Stream* data object represents the independent streaming data that is continuously inputed or outputted via the workflow system. Such an approach can specify the sensory information streaming scenario in IoT, which is not considered in classic BP model design.

Discussion

Most IoT elements were introduced to adapt to specific scenarios. The most conflicted element defined among the literatures is the sensor element. Some works prefer to model sensors as participants but some prefer to hide the physical entity and only consider the corresponding sensor tasks. From our perspective, in real world IoT implementations (e.g. [37]), sensor devices are connected with IP network (either via mediator, gateway, IPv6 or 6LoWPAN [38]), and ideally can be accessed as URI-based RESTful service. Since the standard such as BPMN 2.0 supports URI-based Service Task interaction, it is not clear that differentiating the Sensor Task and Service Task will bring much effort to the process modelling. On the other hand, process such as event streaming [34], which has not yet been considered in classic BP modelling, is necessary to be addressed as new element.

B. Implementation Phase

The *Implementation* phase represents how the system transforms the abstract BP model to the machine-readable and machine-executable software programme. The challenges in this phase mainly involve in lack of corresponding tools. Commonly, BP models were designed in graphical tools, and the tools may generate the machine-readable metadata in order to let the workflow engine execute the processes. However, the common tools such as Activiti (http://activiti.org), Camunda (https://camunda.com), BonitaBPM (http://www.bonitasoft.com), Apache ODE (http://ode.apache.org) do not support many of the protocols used in IoT devices such as CoAP and MQTT. Currently, there is no corresponding tool that can address all the protocols used by the IoT devices. A common approach is to introduce middleware layer to leverage the embedded service from IoT devices with the common SOAP or REST Web services. However, without the proper solution, the system may sacrifice the transparency (in BPM perspective), performance (extra overhead) and agility (reaction of run-time events).

Currently, from the literature studied in this paper, BPMN and BPEL are the two most common standard technologies used in implementation.

- ***BPMN*** has been the most popular approach among the literatures studied in this paper. BPMN was originally designed for the graphical BP modelling. However, it also introduced the metadata form in XML format. It allows extension of elements. Hence, it is possible to introduce new IoT entities and elements semantically using BPMN, XML schema and semantic description methods. Although the extension grants flexibility, there is no interoperability between different design models because they are bound with the execution engine and hence result in isolated solutions. In the other words, the BPMS designed based on makeSense [17] cannot cooperate with uBPMN-based BPMS [35].
- ***BPEL*** was designed meant to be executable and interoperable. The metadata is fully WS-* compliant. Ideally, the BPEL metadata is executable in any standard compliant engines as long as the required corresponding descriptions (WSDL, XML schema etc.) have been fetched. However, the standard itself does not support RESTful service invocation, which is now the primary approach to provide services from IoT devices. Although WSDL 2.0 can describe HTTP method-based invocation, WS-BPEL does not support WSDL 2.0. Current BPEL standard is mainly for SOAP-based service composition only. A number of commercial BPEL engines have support for RESTful service. However, it is not sufficient for the other common protocols that have been used in IoT devices. Hence, BPEL also faces the similar limitation as BPMN. Moreover, BPEL was designed for orchestration only. It does not support choreography natively.

Discussion

Overall, both BPMN and BPEL standards natively do not support the need of distributed process in near future IoT systems. Among the two, BPMN provides the flexibility of extension, hence, it is applicable when interoperability is not the concern of the system. Although some other approaches exist (e.g. Petri-Net model based system [39], [40]), there is no corresponding linkage between the model and the executable programme.

C. Deployment Phase

The *deployment* phase represents how the transformed machine-readable process model is to be executed on the workflow engine located either at the central management server or the front-end IoT devices.

In the classic centralised system, where participants are not required to perform complex processes, the workflow engine only needs to be located at the central system. The IoT devices will be invoked based on regular service request/response operations or the simple socket communication. On the other hand, if process distribution is required, there is a need to enable the process execution at participative nodes (e.g. the node at edge network), in which the process execution engines may need to be embedded at the edge nodes. In general, there are three types of situations in BPMS for IoT. We described them below.

- ***IoT Device Participating in BP***. In this case, the participative node is only performing certain tasks that can be done by request/response. The edge node can simply enable a socket channel to maintain the communication

between themselves and the central system (e.g. a broker or an adaptor located at the central server). Alternatively, the edge node can embed Web services as the service providers [9].

- ***Executing Business Process Model on IoT Devices***. Directly porting or implementing a workflow engine on the IoT device enables the best flexibility. However, such a mechanism requires higher computational power devices (e.g. high-end smartphones). The corresponding approaches have been introduced in past many works [20]–[23] as well as in the recent IoT systems [27], [31]. This kind of approach is applicable in very limited IoT scenarios because they consume a lot of resources.
- ***Executing Binary Code on IoT Devices***. It is based on translating the BP model metadata to binary code or executable source code. This approach may be more suitable for low level resource constrained devices to execute the BP models. In this approach, all the BP model will be translated to corresponding binary code or programme source code before they are sent to the edge node for execution.

Discussion
The drawback of the binary code approach is that every time the process model changes, it needs to be again converted to the executable source code at the backend and to be deployed at the edge node for execution. Comparing it to the direct BP engine approach, the BP engine can perform more quick changes in the model and execution.

D. Management and Optimisation Phase

The goal of BPM is continuous monitoring and optimising the system. *Management & optimisation* phase addresses how the system can continuously operate and improve. It requires autonomous mechanisms such as fault tolerant, self-managing, self-adapting, context-awareness and scalability.

Fault Tolerant
IoT involves large number of wireless network connected things. These things are known to have less stability in communication link and the lower battery capability. A proper BPMS needs to consider about these resource constrained things and support the corresponding solutions such as reactively replacing the failure entities or activities with substitutions immediately and autonomously in order to retain the processes [31]. Further, in order to optimise the system to react or even prevent the failure, a certain business process may need to be distributed and governed by the edge networks. For example, considering the unreliable mobile Internet connection, authors in [18] have proposed a framework for distributing and executing tasks at the edge mobile nodes in offline mode.

Adaptation and Context-awareness
In IoT, enabling self-managing needs to consider the edge network. In order to support agility, the edge network requires certain degree of self-managing and self-adapting capabilities. A number of peers at the edge network should act as super-peers that are capable of monitoring the network and directly decide what to do when events happened. For example, in [37], edge nodes can collaborate to reduce energy consumption. In many scenarios [8], [18], [27], [31], [35], IoT systems are based on ubiquitous computing system that involves the requirement of self-adaptation. *"Self-adaptive software modifies its own behaviour in response to changes in its operating environment"* [41]. The approaches of adaptation can be roughly categorised to reactive and proactive. The reactive adaptation represents the system will perform a certain activity according to the event that just occurred. The proactive adaptation denotes the system can prevent or predict the upcoming events and hence, perform the activity proactively. Both approaches require the corresponding information of the event. Such information is considered as context.

Context-awareness is a major requirement in the ubiquitous computing based IoT applications [18], [35]. Context-aware BPM can comprehend the environment in order to adapt the business process workflow. Such a feature can highly improve the efficiency and quality of the IoT systems that encompass with heterogeneous entities. While provisioning data for supporting context-awareness is no longer an issue, the real challenge falls in how to manipulate the context data derived from large scale pervasive sources towards providing the meaningful, situation-aware information to support the IoT systems [33].

Approaches for supporting context-awareness differs from one to another. Broadly, it can be classified to two types: entity's context or environmental context. For works in smart ubiquitous computing domain [18], [31], context-awareness is usually considering the entity's context. The entity in most cases is the human user themselves. The context can be the heartbeat rate, blood, breath, physical movement etc. Works in ambient assistance domain [8], [27], [35] may consider environmental context surrounding to the central entity. For example, the temperature, the noise level, the density of crowd etc. Such context information is not triggered by the central entity but is generated by the external factors.

Scalability
Scalability is one of the major requirements for management of large scale connected things [33], [50]–[52].

Among the existing works, Dar et al. [31] have proposed a distributed business process execution solution. Considering when the involved IoT entities are increased, especially when the mobile nodes are involved, a certain process is better to be performed in a choreography manner to improve the agility of processes. In [31], they proposed the mobile edge node execution approach, in which the Android-based smart phone has embedded the standard compliant BPMN engine to execute the business processes. Because recent smartphones are quite capable of processing complex tasks [53], and the availability of standard protocols (e.g. CoAP, MQTT) designed for resource constrained devices, the overall performance of the mobile node involved choreography was fairly acceptable. Wu et al. [46] also addressed scalability in their work. They

Table II: BPMS for IoT frameworks comparison.

Projects	Modelling Things	Event Streaming	Fault Tolerant	Distributed Process	Standard Compliant	Context-aware Adaptation	Scalability
Decoflow [8]	EM (↓)	—	—	—	BP (∼)	EC (∼)	PF (↓)
Presto [42]	EM (↓)	—	—	MP (↓)	BM (∼)	—	—
LTP [29]	EM (↓)	—	—	MB (∼)	BP (∼)	—	—
Caracaş et al. [43]	EM (↑)	—	—	MB (↓)	BM (↑)	—	—
RWIS [44]	EM (↓)	—	—	—	BP (∼)	—	—
edUFlow [45]	EM (↓)	—	—	—	—	—	—
GaaS [46]	EM (↓)	—	—	—	BP (↓)	—	GC (∼)
BPMN4WSN [16]	IE (∼)	—	—	—	BM (∼)	—	PF (↓)
Peng et al. [18]	EM (↓)	—	—	MP (↑)	BM (↑)	PC (∼)	—
Martinho & Ferrira et al. [47], [48]	EM (↓)	—	—	—	BM (↓)	—	—
SPUs [34]	IE (↑)	LO (↑)	MC (∼)	—	BM (∼)	—	PF (↓)
makeSense [17], [30], [49]	IE (∼)	CC (↑)	—	MB (↓)	BM (↑)	—	PF (↓)
uBPMN [35]	IE/NM (∼)	—	—	—	BM (↑)	EC (∼)	PF (↓)
Meyer et al. [28]	IE/NM (∼)	—	—	—	BM (∼)	—	—
Dar et al. [31]	EM (∼)	—	FS (∼)	ME (↑)	BM (↑)	PC (∼)	ME (∼)
SCORPII [27]	EM (↓)	—	—	ME (↑)	BP (∼)	EC (↓)	—

Subject addressed level: (↑) = high; (∼) = medium; (↓)= low;

Modelling things		Event streaming		Fault tolerant		Distributed process	
IE	New IoT element	LO	Logistic	MC	Connectivity	MP	Participating BP with mobile/edge
NM	New meta model	CC	Crowd computing	FS	Substitution	MB	Converted code execution on mobile/edge
EM	Existing methods	—	Not addressed	—	Not addressed	ME	BP model execution on mobile/edge
						—	Not addressed

Standard compliant		Context-aware adaptation		Scalability	
BP	BPEL	EC	Environmental context	MM	Mobile edge process management
BM	BPMN	PC	Participant's context	GC	Gateway-based cloud computing
—	Not addressed	—	Not addressed	PF	Minor addressed or planed as future work
				—	Not addressed

introduced the Gateway as a Service (GaaS)-based architecture that enables cross-organisational collaboration among the IoT devices. The GaaS architecture is based on the foundation of cloud services (Infrastructure as a Service, Platform as a Service, Software as a Service). By integrating the cloud services and the mediator technology, enterprises can connect their IoT entities as Web of Things (WoT) collaboratively.

Discussion

The major purpose of BPM is to optimise the processes of organisations. The BPMS designed for IoT needs to clearly address the challenges in the field. Currently, existing works in BPMS for IoT are still in early stages. Most works are focusing on proposing the solutions for the previous three phases—*design, implementation* and *deployment*. Although some works discussed in this section have addressed a few issues in management and optimisation, they have not proposed concrete, generic solutions for the specific challenges involved in IoT environment.

IV. Comparison of Frameworks

Here, we provide a comprehensive comparison of existing works (see Table II) based on the requirements described in previous sections. Although the frameworks have been applied in different domains, all of them involve either Wireless Sensor Network (WSN) nodes or mobile network nodes. As the comparison table shows, most works are directly using existing method to model the IoT entities and activities. Almost all the works state a certain level of compliant to the standard (either BPEL or BPMN). From the table, it can be clearly seen that:

Very few have considered fault tolerant and context-awareness in BPMS for IoT. At this stage, it is not clear whether the existing process models can already address the fault tolerant and context-awareness or not. In IoT, the two subjects can involve mobile nodes. Since the common BPMS were designed for static participant and controlled environment, integrating BPMS with IoT can raise new issues that have not yet been seen in the classic BPMS. Addressing fault tolerant requires the process model to describe the detail process of the involved entities. The model such as [35], which does not address the activities of the IoT entities (e.g. sensor, actuator, reader etc.), may not be able to identify the cause of the failure, and hence, the BP modeller cannot design the corresponding recovery processes for the potential failures.

Another point is the distributed process. Most works did not consider such feature. Either they might not have seen the mobile entities will be the participants of IoT or they assumed the mobile entities will be connected with stable sink or gateways. Also, they might have not considered that the need

of proximity-based opportunistic Machine-to-Machine (M2M) communication among the IoT entities. Among the distributed process support, there are two main approach types: handling the distributed business process with BP execution engine in mobile/edge nodes or handling the process with the generated binary code derived from the BP model. For highly resource constrained nodes, the second approach appears to be more adaptable.

Overall, many authors agreed the scalability is an important requirement but very few of them have addressed the corresponding strategy. As mentioned in previously section, Wu et al. [46] proposed Gateway as a Service to support scalability, and Dar et al. [31] introduced choreography-based service composition in which a certain potion of process models can be distributed and executed at the mobile/edge nodes.

V. Potential Issues and Open Challenges

Based on our study, in this section, we identify a number of challenges that have not yet been fully addressed in existing BPMS for IoT frameworks.

A. Model Standardisation

Currently, there is no common agreeable way to model the IoT entities and their activities in business process model tools. Beside the different things that require different ways of model (e.g. modelling actuator is different to modelling data collector), the same type entity can have been modelled in many different ways. For example, based on our literature review, sensor devices already have been modelled in at least four different ways. Further, there is a need to model the things in detail in order to ease the process of transforming the process model into machine-readable metadata form so that it can be further executed. The need of standard model in things is not only about the notations but also involve in the meta model level. it is better to have the capabilities for the designer to define what kind of protocol and operation is used for the thing and where the message flow is performed. It is important for BPMS which needs to compose information from different sources dynamically.

B. Heterogeneity of Participants

The heterogeneity of the participative IoT devices in BPM involves the challenges in connectivity, discoverability, mobility/accessibility, self-manageability and self-configuring. Here, we discuss the heterogeneity of participants in different layers.

- ***Physical Object Layer***. Different physical thing has different capability but they can be used for the same purposes. When the BP model involves different type of physical thing, the model need to specify the differences. Certain level of decomposition may need to be performed in order to illustrate the detail of process feasibility. Further, it may need an efficient ontology to classify the physical things.
- ***Embedded Service Layer***. Services provided by the physical things depend on the communication protocol such as classic Bluetooth, Bluetooth Smart LE, CoAP, Alljoyn (https://allseenalliance.org), MQTT, AMQP (https://www.amqp.org) etc. These common IoT protocols work in different ways, and they influence the performance of the management system. Future BPMS for IoT requires an adaptive solution to provide self-configuration among the different connectivities.
- ***Service Description Level***. Currently, various approaches have been introduced to describe the IoT services/resources. From the Web service-oriented architecture perspective, WSDL, WADL [54], DPWS [55] have been used. The other international standard organisations have also introduced numerous standard descriptions. For example, SensorML (http://www.ogcnetwork.net/SensorML), SenML [56] have been introduced to describe sensor devices. Further, UPnP has been introduced for many years for general office devices. Recently, IETF also introduced CoAP (RFC7252) & CoRE standards for describing resources. The one of the most common short range protocol—Bluetooth also has its own description mechanism such as UUID and many different port names to describe devices and resources. Moreover, we haven't mentioned about the JSON-based service descriptions. It is now becoming impossible to rely on one single standard to enable autonomous M2M communication due to lack of global common standard for machine readable metadata.
- ***Service Discovery Layer***. In IoT, relying on a global central repository is less possible. It is foreseeable that the future IoT will be relying on a large scale federated service discovery network established based on mesh network topology. Moreover, proximity-based and opportunistic discovery also stand for important role to map physical visibility with digital visibility. Inter-organisational BPM, crowdsourcing, crowdsensing, social IoT, realtime augmented reality, ambient assistance for mobile healthcare will all need such a feature to quickly establish M2M connection and collaboration in physical proximity.

C. Distributed Process and Collaborated Network

In near future, IoT will be applied in various urban sensing scenarios [57]–[59] in which heterogeneous mobile objects will be involved in the processes. BPMS for IoT in such scenarios will face the mobility, addressing, connectivity challenges that affect the performance and quality of the distributed processes. Further, the BPMS for distributed process also need to address cost and energy efficiency for the mobile participants, which may require process scheduling models to optimise the data transmission cost. Moreover, apart from urban sensing, in large scale crowd-sensing scenarios, the BP models also need to address how to improve and optimise the process of sensing task distribution and sensory data acquisition from the crowd. It may also involve how to model the opportunistic sensing processes and mobile ad hoc sensing in proximity.

The future IoT in public area will also involve collaborative sensing network in which different organisations or individuals may share the already deployed resources such as sensors and sensory data collector devices [46]. Process models for such an environment will be very complex and will face many challenges such as privacy and trust issues. The privacy issue involves what resources can be shared and how they will be shared? The trust issue involves how does an organisation provide the trustworthy resource or sensory data sharing? These issues will further require adaptive Quality of Service (QoS) models and the scalable Service Level Agreement (SLA) schemes to adapt to different situations and preferences.

D. Context-awareness

BPM in IoT needs to address context-awareness in terms of contingencies, personalisation, efficiency and performance [32]. Contingencies involve the unpredictable connectivity and accessibility of pervasive services and wireless network devices. Personalisation involves service provisioning based on the requesters' preferences. Efficiency involves energy efficiency, cost of deployment and cost of communication. The challenges in efficiency derives from the fundamental infrastructure of IoT involves a large number of resource constrained devices. The performance is affected by the reliability of the connected things including the protocol they used to communicated with the back-end information systems. From our study of existing works (see Section IV), only a few researches have addressed the context-awareness.

E. Scalability

Scalability in the short term, the system should be able to autonomously handle the increasing number of IoT entities at the edge network [31]. From the long term, the system should support inter-organisational interaction in which the large scale entities will get involved. They will be able to perform autonomous communication and are capable of collaborating. It is foreseen that in near future IoT, organisations will share the resources of the already deployed infrastructures [46]. IoT entities will be able to perform autonomous M2M communication to establish collaboration among neighbouring devices in an opportunistic manner [33]. Such collaboration can highly benefit the small and medium enterprises in cost efficiency. Although the importance of scalability has been considered in many works [16], [30], [34], [35], they have not proposed the corresponding solutions.

VI. Proposed Design

In this Section, we proposed a preliminary architecture design for the BPMS for IoT. The goal of this design is to provide an entry point for researchers in MCC discipline to understand how MCC can help building BPMS for IoT and what are the issues need to be addressed.

The power of cloud derives from resource virtualisation. We take a step forward to virtualise physical entities from small objects to spatial representation. First of all, we introduce the cloud-based Virtual Thing (VT). It is different to the other works [60]–[62] that only consider the things as electronic devices (e.g. sensors, actuators, smart phones etc.). In here, the VT represents a concept of a physical entity in the digital world that is mainly illustrated by a cloud service instance. The physical entity can be a creature, an electronic device, a building, a street, a city or so forth.

Here, we also introduce the concept of the Internet of Proximity (IoP). This concept provides a spatial service that encompasses with proximity-based M2M communication, virtualisation-based mobile cloud service provisioning and managed by context-aware adaptive BPMS that enables scalable inter-organisational process collaboration. The



Figure 3: Mobile cloud-based virtual thing and the Internet of Proximity.

Virtual Thing (VT) provider provides an instance that is continuously accessible and continuously presenting the information that is of interest to the users in their proximity. Further, the VT does not only provide the raw information but also the interpreted meaningful information for the user. The VT service provisioning also benefits to the enterprise for enabling collaboration among a set of IoT devices in proximity, which can reduce the cost of deployment, monitoring and maintenance.

Figure 3 illustrates the environmental architecture. The environment consists of following major elements:

Center

The IoP represents the surrounding physical things of the *Center* (located at the left-bottom side of the Figure). *Center* can be a mobile smartphone, a static Cloudlet Virtual Machine (Cloudlet VM) [63], or any smart object that has the computational power and is capable of performing service discovery in proximity using common industrial standard/specification such as Bluetooth, Alljoyn, Multicast DNS (http://www.multicastdns.org) etc. Based on the application scenario, the *Center* can be one of the process participants or it can be the composer that initiates the entire process. The requester, who is the process modeller, has pre-established connection with the *Center*.

Physical Things (PT)

PT are things such as sensors, actuators, data collectors, smartphones, gateway devices etc. that are discoverable and intractable by some sort of protocols. PT can belong to different organisations and they have their backend management servers. In general, there are three basic access levels of PT:

- *Web of Things*. This way, the thing is either directly providing service or via the middleware service. The process model can interact with the thing as a Service Task (in BPMN) but it cannot execute specific source code, neither executing a process model.
- *Permitted process execution things*. The things that embedded with standard-based process execution engine that can execute processes based on the model description. When the process model involves this kind of thing, modellers need to check whether the corresponding components are available or not (e.g. allow to access the GPS function? Or does it have GPS function as a usable mechanism?). Another possible approach is to grant the modeller to use limited script language to model the behaviour of the things.
- *Fully controlled things*. The things that belong to exactly same department and same system or have been granted full control permission in which the modellers have full control on them in both executing process model, or executing source code. Prerequisite is the corresponding execution engines/methods have been installed. Full control gives best flexibility, performance, and the quality of the composition. For low-level devices such as Arduino microcontroller, enabling code execution is the best way not only for performance but also saving energy because process execution engines (e.g. BPMN engine) require much higher computational resources and also consume more energy. However, in large scale connected things that involve multiple departments, organisations with the things managed by different parties, expecting full control on all the things is highly challenge.

Backends

Backends are the managers of PT. Some organisations support M2M collaboration mechanism or Sensing as a Service (SSaaS) [64] in which they allow their PT to be interacting in a certain Service Level Agreement (SLA). Backends can provide the communication mechanisms for enabling the requesters interact with their PT. For example, a backend can provide the communication method as regular Web service invocation based on HTTP or CoAP, or in the more advanced scenario, the backend can provide the model-based source code or plug-in for the requesters to interact with their PT using the organisations' own protocols. Either way, the backends create secure *Virtual Thing Unit* components to enable the communication between the requesters and their PT.

Virtual Thing Unit (VTU)

A VTU is a piece of software that is configured and packed by a *backend* at run-time when it receives a request for accessing the corresponding PT(s). A VTU is similar to a driver that allows the requester interacting with PTs directly without going through the indirect message brokering between the *backend* and requester. Different requesters will be assigned different functions for the VTU they use, it is based on the SLA agreed between the requesters and the backends. The VTU maintains a secure channel between itself and its *backend* server in order to let the *backend* monitor the activities between the PT and the requester.

Federated Service Discovery Network (FSDN)

The IoT is based on federated network environment. FSDN is the global mesh network that allows service providers to publish or advertise their services to the service registries. Service registries maintain the connection and also brokering the information to extend the discovery performance. Requesters can discover the services from FSDN by providing a certain information such as the URI, the name or simply a location coordinate. It depends on the searching mechanisms provided by the service discovery server.

Virtual Thing Host (VTH)

VTH is a dynamic launched cloud instance; it uses elastic cloud resources to create VT for requesters. It handles the establishment of VTU with backends and manages all the communication channels in the Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) manner. Further, it uses load balancer scheme to manage the scalable cloud resources, and it applies the plug-and-play approach to support scalable connection among things. VTH also translates the process model into corresponding byte code for low-level devises to execute the processes in the choreography manner.

Virtual Thing (VT)

VT can be seen as a dynamic deployed Platform as a Service (PaaS) on top of Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS) for user to build a Software as a Service (SaaS) based on composing the VTUs. It represents from single VTU to the spatial environment that consists of multiple VTU. In case of the *Center* is a static node, the VTU contained in the VT may not frequently change. If the *Center* is a mobile node that is continuously moving, the VTU in the VT may be changed accordantly. VT is hosted in VT Host and can be modelled by the requester. When a requester sends a process model to VT, VT will execute the model. All the VTU connected in

VT can be utilised as participants of the process model. The communication channels between VT Host and PTs is fully managed. This is done by proactive service discovery schemes and service description pre-fetching and pre-processing (e.g. [65], [66]). In summary, VT has following features:

- It inherits all the features of cloud such as scalable computational resources, bandwidth, load balancing, dynamic deployment.
- It follows the Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) architecture in which it allows plug-and-play to add and remove VTU.
- It performs BP model execution. It can also distribute process to PT nodes by utilising the BP model execution engines or the byte code containers located at the nodes

VII. Conclusion

In this paper, we have reviewed the state-of-the-art in BPMS for IoT. We provide the taxonomy and comparison of existing frameworks and further identify the potential issues and open challenges in the field. Later, we proposed a design architecture to adapt MCC to BPMS for IoT.

The vision of this paper to be given is that *"Mobile Cloud Computing is the core enabler of the business process management for the Internet of Things"*. Disciplines in MCC have covered all the promising technologies to resolve the challenges and issues in BPMS for IoT. This presents an excellent opportunity for researchers in MCC field to develop solutions to overcome the challenges in BPMS for IoT identified in this paper.

Acknowledgment

This research is supported by the Estonian Science Foundation grant PUT360.

References

[1] J. Gubbi, R. Buyya, S. Marusic, and M. Palaniswami, "Internet of Things (IoT): A vision, architectural elements, and future directions," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 29, no. 7, pp. 1645 – 1660, 2013.

[2] L. Atzori, A. Iera, and G. Morabito, "The internet of things: A survey," *Computer networks*, vol. 54, no. 15, pp. 2787–2805, 2010.

[3] D. Evans, "The internet of things: How the next evolution of the internet is changing everything," *CISCO white paper*, vol. 1, p. 14, 2011.

[4] P. Middleton, P. Kjeldsen, and J. Tully, "Forecast: The internet of things, worldwide, 2013," *Gartner Research*, 2013.

[5] J. Manyika, M. Chui, J. Bughin, R. Dobbs, P. Bisson, and A. Marrs, *Disruptive technologies: Advances that will transform life, business, and the global economy*. McKinsey Global Institute, 2013, vol. 180.

[6] D. Lund, C. MacGillivray, V. Turner, and M. Morales, "Worldwide and regional internet of things (iot) 2014–2020 forecast: A virtuous circle of proven value and demand," *International Data Corporation (IDC), Tech. Rep*, 2014.

[7] K. Dar, A. Taherkordi, R. Rouvoy, and F. Eliassen, "Adaptable service composition for very-large-scale internet of things systems," in *Proceedings of the 8th Middleware Doctoral Symposium*, ser. MDS '11. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2011, pp. 2:1–2:6.

[8] S. W. Loke, "Service-oriented device ecology workflows," in *Service-Oriented Computing-ICSOC 2003*. Springer, 2003, pp. 559–574.

[9] S. Srirama, M. Jarke, and W. Prinz, "Mobile web service provisioning," in *the 2006 Int. Conf. on Internet and Web Applications and Services/Advanced Telecommunications*, Feb 2006, pp. 120–125.

[10] M. Dumas, M. La Rosa, J. Mendling, and H. A. Reijers, *Fundamentals of business process management*. Springer, 2013.

[11] D. Jordan, J. Evdemon, A. Alves, A. Arkin, S. Askary, C. Barreto, B. Bloch, F. Curbera, M. Ford, Y. Goland *et al.*, "Web services business process execution language version 2.0," *OASIS standard*, vol. 11, no. 120, p. 5, 2007.

[12] B. P. Model, "Notation (bpmn) version 2.0," *OMG Specification, Object Management Group*, 2011.

[13] W. van der Aalst, A. ter Hofstede, and M. Weske, "Business process management: A survey," in *Business Process Management*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, W. van der Aalst and M. Weske, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2003, vol. 2678, pp. 1–12.

[14] C. Chang and S. Ling, "Towards a context-aware solution for device failures in service-oriented workflow," in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Information Integration and Web-based Applications & Services*. ACM, 2008, pp. 77–83.

[15] P. Kucherbaev, S. Tranquillini, F. Daniel, F. Casati, M. Marchese, M. Brambilla, and P. Fraternali, "Business processes for the crowd computer," in *Business process management workshops*. Springer, 2013, pp. 256–267.

[16] C. T. Sungur, P. Spiess, N. Oertel, and O. Kopp, "Extending bpmn for wireless sensor networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE 15th Conference on Business Informatics (CBI)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 109–116.

[17] S. Tranquillini, P. Spieß, F. Daniel, S. Karnouskos, F. Casati, N. Oertel, L. Mottola, F. J. Oppermann, G. P. Picco, K. Römer *et al.*, "Process-based design and integration of wireless sensor network applications," in *Business Process Management*. Springer, 2012, pp. 134–149.

[18] T. Peng, M. Ronchetti, J. Stevovic, A. Chiasera, and G. Armellin, "Business process assignment and execution from cloud to mobile," in *Business Process Management Workshops*, 2014, pp. 264–276.

[19] S. Chandler, "Unlocking the power of the internet of things through bpm," in *BPM Everywhere: Internet of Things, Process of Everything*, L. Fischer and F. Strategies, Eds. Future Strategies, 2015, pp. 183–189.

[20] G. Hackmann, M. Haitjema, C. Gill, and G.-C. Roman, "Sliver: A bpel workflow process execution engine for mobile devices," in *Service-Oriented Computing*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, A. Dan and W. Lamersdorf, Eds. Springer, 2006, vol. 4294, pp. 503–508.

[21] R. Pryss, J. Tiedeken, U. Kreher, and M. Reichert, "Towards flexible process support on mobile devices," in *Information Systems Evolution*, ser. Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing, P. Soffer and E. Proper, Eds. Springer, 2011, vol. 72, pp. 150–165.

[22] R. Sen, G.-C. Roman, and C. Gill, "Cian: A workflow engine for manets," in *Coordination Models and Languages*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, D. Lea and G. Zavattaro, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, vol. 5052, pp. 280–295.

[23] T. Chou, S. Chang, Y. Lu, Y. Wang, M. Ouyang, C. Shih, T. Kuo, J. Hu, and J. Liu, "Emwf for flexible automation and assistive devices," in *Proceedings of the 15th IEEE Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium*, April 2009, pp. 243–252.

[24] C. Chang, S. N. Srirama, and S. Ling, "Spica: A social private cloud computing application framework," in *the 13th Int.l Conf. on Mobile and Ubiquitous Multimedia*. ACM, 2014, pp. 30–39.

[25] C. Chang, S. Srirama, and S. Ling, "An adaptive mediation framework for mobile p2p social content sharing," in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Service Oriented Computing*. Springer, 2012, pp. 374–388.

[26] C. Chang, S. N. Srirama, and S. Ling, "Towards an adaptive mediation framework for mobile social network in proximity," *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, vol. 12, pp. 179 – 196, 2014.

[27] C. Chang, S. Srirama, and J. Mass, "A middleware for discovering proximity-based service-oriented industrial internet of things," in *Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE International Conference on Services Computing (SCC)*, June 2015, pp. 130–137.

[28] S. Meyer, A. Ruppen, and L. Hilty, "The things of the internet of things in bpmn," in *Advanced Information Systems Engineering Workshops*. Springer, 2015, pp. 285–297.

[29] N. Glombitza, S. Ebers, D. Pfisterer, and S. Fischer, "Using bpel to realize business processes for an internet of things," in *Ad-hoc, Mobile, and Wireless Networks*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, H. Frey, X. Li, and S. Ruehrup, Eds. Springer, 2011, vol. 6811, pp. 294–307.

[30] S. Tranquillini, F. Daniel, P. Kucherbaev, and F. Casati, "Bpmn task instance streaming for efficient micro-task crowdsourcing processes," in *Business Process Management*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, H. R. Motahari-Nezhad, J. Recker, and M. Weidlich, Eds. Springer International Publishing, 2015, vol. 9253, pp. 333–349.

[31] K. Dar, A. Taherkordi, H. Baraki, F. Eliassen, and K. Geihs, "A resource oriented integration architecture for the internet of things: A business process perspective," *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, vol. 20, pp. 145 – 159, 2015.

[32] Q. Z. Sheng, X. Qiao, A. V. Vasilakos, C. Szabo, S. Bourne, and X. Xu, "Web services composition: A decades overview," *Information Sciences*, vol. 280, pp. 218 – 238, 2014.

[33] M. Conti, S. K. Das, C. Bisdikian, M. Kumar, L. M. Ni, A. Passarella, G. Roussos, G. Trster, G. Tsudik, and F. Zambonelli, "Looking ahead in pervasive computing: Challenges and opportunities in the era of cyberphysical convergence," *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 2 – 21, 2012.

[34] S. Appel, P. Kleber, S. Frischbier, T. Freudenreich, and A. Buchmann, "Modeling and execution of event stream processing in business processes," *Information Systems*, vol. 46, pp. 140 – 156, 2014.

[35] A. Yousfi, A. de Freitas, A. Dey, and R. Saidi, "The use of ubiquitous computing for business process improvement," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. PP, no. 99, pp. 1–1, 2015.

[36] S. Appel, S. Frischbier, T. Freudenreich, and A. Buchmann, "Event stream processing units in business processes," in *Business Process Management*. Springer, 2013, pp. 187–202.

[37] C. Chang, S. Loke, H. Dong, F. Salim, S. Srirama, M. Liyanage, and S. Ling, "An energy-efficient inter-organizational wireless sensor data collection framework," in *Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS)*, June 2015, pp. 639–646.

[38] Z. Shelby and C. Bormann, *6LoWPAN: The wireless embedded Internet*. John Wiley & Sons, 2011, vol. 43.

[39] P. Igei Kaneshiro, P. Haghighi, and S. Ling, "Situation-aware adaptation to optimise energy consumption in intelligent buildings using coloured petri nets," in *Proceedings of the IEEE 9th Conference on Industrial Electronics and Applications (ICIEA)*, June 2014, pp. 231–236.

[40] R. A. Thacker, K. R. Jones, C. J. Myers, and H. Zheng, "Automatic abstraction for verification of cyber-physical systems," in *Proceedings of the 1st ACM/IEEE International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems*, ser. ICCPS '10. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2010, pp. 12–21.

[41] P. Oreizy, M. Gorlick, R. Taylor, D. Heimhigner, G. Johnson, N. Medvidovic, A. Quilici, D. Rosenblum, and A. Wolf, "An architecture-based approach to self-adaptive software," *IEEE Intelligent Systems and their Applications*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 54–62, May 1999.

[42] P. Giner, C. Cetina, J. Fons, and V. Pelechano, "Developing mobile workflow support in the internet of things," *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 18–26, Apr. 2010.

[43] A. Caraca and T. Kramp, "On the expressiveness of bpmn for modeling wireless sensor networks applications," in *Business Process Model and Notation*, ser. Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing, R. Dijkman, J. Hofstetter, and J. Koehler, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, vol. 95, pp. 16–30.

[44] C. Yang, N. Chen, and L. Di, "Restful based heterogeneous geoprocessing workflow interoperation for sensor web service," *Computers & Geosciences*, vol. 47, pp. 102–110, 2012.

[45] J.-Y. Jung, P. Rosales, K. Oh, and K. Kim, "eduflow: An event-driven ubiquitous flow management system," in *Business Process Management Workshops*, ser. Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing, F. Daniel, K. Barkaoui, and S. Dustdar, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012, vol. 99, pp. 427–432.

[46] Z. Wu, T. Itala, T. Tang, C. Zhang, Y. Ji, M. Hamalainen, and Y. Liu, "Gateway as a service: A cloud computing framework for web of things," in *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Telecommunications (ICT)*, April 2012, pp. 1–6.

[47] R. Martinho and D. Domingos, "Quality of information and access cost of iot resources in bpmn processes," *Procedia Technology*, vol. 16, pp. 737 – 744, 2014, cENTERIS 2014 - Conference on ENTERprise Information Systems.

[48] P. Ferreira, R. Martinho, and D. Domingos, "Process invariants: An approach to model expected exceptions," *Procedia Technology*, vol. 16, pp. 824 – 833, 2014, cENTERIS 2014 - Conference on ENTERprise Information Systems.

[49] F. Casati, F. Daniel, G. Dantchev, J. Eriksson, N. Finne, S. Karnouskos, and et. al, "Towards business processes orchestrating the physical enterprise with wireless sensor networks," in *the 34th Int. Conf. on Software Engineering*, June 2012, pp. 1357–1360.

[50] T. Teixeira, S. Hachem, V. Issarny, and N. Georgantas, "Service oriented middleware for the internet of things: A perspective," in *Towards a Service-Based Internet*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, W. Abramowicz, I. Llorente, M. Surridge, A. Zisman, and J. Vayssire, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, vol. 6994, pp. 220–229.

[51] V. Issarny, N. Georgantas, S. Hachem, A. Zarras, P. Vassiliadist, M. Autili, M. Gerosa, and A. Hamida, "Service-oriented middleware for the future internet: state of the art and research directions," *Journal of Internet Services and Applications*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 23–45, 2011.

[52] E. Borgia, "The internet of things vision: Key features, applications and open issues," *Computer Communications*, vol. 54, pp. 1 – 31, 2014.

[53] H. Flores, S. Srirama, and R. Buyya, "Computational offloading or data binding? bridging the cloud infrastructure to the proximity of the mobile user," in *Proceedings of the 2nd IEEE Intl. Conf. on Mobile Cloud Computing, Services, and Engineering*, 2014, pp. 10–18.

[54] M. J. Hadley, "Web application description language (wadl)," Sun Microsystems, Mountain View, CA, USA, Tech. Rep., 2006.

[55] D. Driscoll, A. Mensch, T. Nixon, and A. Regnier, "Devices profile for web services version 1.1," *OASIS Standard*, vol. 1, p. 4, 2009.

[56] C. Jennings, J. Arkko, and Z. Shelby, "Media types for sensor markup language (senml)," *IETF*, 2012.

[57] F. Salim and U. Haque, "Urban computing in the wild: A survey on large scale participation and citizen engagement with ubiquitous computing, cyber physical systems, and internet of things," *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, vol. 81, pp. 31 – 48, 2015.

[58] S. W. Loke, K. Napier, A. Alali, N. Fernando, and W. Rahayu, "Mobile computations with surrounding devices: Proximity sensing and multilayered work stealing," *ACM Trans. Embed. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 22:1–22:25, Feb. 2015.

[59] S. W. Loke, "On crowdsourcing information maps: Cornucopia of the commons for the city," in *Adjunct Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing and Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Symposium on Wearable Computers*, ser. UbiComp/ISWC'15 Adjunct. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2015, pp. 1527–1533.

[60] P. Parwekar, "From internet of things towards cloud of things," in *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Computer and Communication Technology (ICCCT)*, Sept 2011, pp. 329–333.

[61] M. Aazam, I. Khan, A. Alsaffar, and E.-N. Huh, "Cloud of things: Integrating internet of things and cloud computing and the issues involved," in *Proceedings of the 11th International Bhurban Conference on Applied Sciences and Technology (IBCAST)*, Jan 2014, pp. 414–419.

[62] S. Distefano, G. Merlino, and A. Puliafito, "Enabling the cloud of things," in *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Innovative Mobile and Internet Services in Ubiquitous Computing (IMIS)*, July 2012, pp. 858–863.

[63] B. Gao, L. He, L. Liu, K. Li, and S. A. Jarvis, "From mobiles to clouds: Developing energy-aware offloading strategies for workflows," in *the ACM/IEEE 13th International Conference on Grid Computing*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 139–146.

[64] A. Zaslavsky, C. Perera, and D. Georgakopoulos, "Sensing as a service and big data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.0159*, 2013.

[65] C. Chang, S. Ling, and S. Krishnaswamy, "Promws: Proactive mobile web service provision using context-awareness," in *Proceedings of the 2011 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications Workshops*, March 2011, pp. 69–74.

[66] C. Chang, S. N. Srirama, S. Krishnaswamy, and S. Ling, "Proactive web service discovery for mobile social network in proximity," *Journal of Next Generation Information Technology*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 100, 2013.